temporary and consecutive academies in Italy. It also becomes clear through Testa's examples that these networks reached far across the Italian peninsula from early on, and one has to agree with the author that these networks are not only a forerunner or a model of the "Republic of Letters" of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but that they should be understood as its beginnings.

Chapter 3 deals with "Italian Academies and Their Facebooks," discussing the manners in which some of the academies proudly presented their members, publications, and international connections. The author's comparison to contemporary digital platforms such as Facebook is problematic: the fundamental problem here seems to be the notion of "social network," which can surely be attributed to early modern networks, but perhaps not to today's commercial firms that collect as many data as possible about their members (who are in fact the product to be sold to advertisers).

Last but not least, Testa's book is not only a stimulating read but also a vast source of information, confronting readers with different fields that they may not have considered before. The notes to the main text fill almost one-quarter of the entire book, which, combined with the rich bibliography and index, make it a "database on paper"—though this database is wisely restricted to some aspects of the Italian academies project. The IAD surely contains much more material that may become the fundament for similar studies on academies and intellectual networks of other times and places, and from different historical and methodological points of view. It is therefore no question that the IAD should be continued and even extend its sources of information, encouraging a wider participation of interested researchers. That the entire database is freely available for download as XML files that may be integrated into similar projects is an important step in this direction.

Bernd Kulawik

Dirk van Miert, Henk Nellen, Piet Steenbakkers, and Jetze Touber, eds., *Scriptural Authority and Biblical Criticism in the Dutch Golden Age: God's Word Questioned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017. Pp. 480. £85.00.

Nicholas Hardy, *Criticism and Confession: The Bible in the Seventeenth-Century Republic of Letters*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017. Pp. 480. £80.00.

Religion has received little attention in the history of humanities, but these two outstanding books raise powerful questions that might be broadly applied. Can a religious environment advance the humanities? Is humanistic study in a religious environment

unusual or distinctive? How has humanistic study promoted or undermined religion? *Scriptural Authority* is a fascinating snapshot of a fast-moving field, while Nicholas Hardy's brilliant book is destined for a long life thanks to its intensive research and bold revisionist argument.

In earlier decades, the study of early modern humanism and religion largely meant the criticism of the Bible; discussion centered on famous names such as Erasmus, Scaliger, and Grotius. Scholars aimed to trace the rise of sophisticated philological methods like those of classical study, acknowledging that theological environments raised difficulties or antagonisms for critics.

Today a vast movement exploring religion and scholarship far more broadly is under way, especially in the Renaissance field. Historians often conclude that real philological methods were inextricable from theological and sectarian goals, and research has ranged over historical criticism, the study of the Bible, the study of ancient material culture, orientalism, and more.

So the great Greek scholar Isaac Casaubon studied Hebrew throughout his life, attacking the fake Egyptian sage Hermes Trismegistus much as he had earlier attacked the Christian Hebraist Pietro Galatino on rabbinic prophecy (Anthony Grafton and Joanna Weinberg); mapmakers drew technically sophisticated schemas of Rome that combined ancient archaeological sites with modern churches (Jessica Maier); Spanish antiquaries applied modern critical techniques to fake ecclesiastical chronicles and inscriptions (Katrina Olds); the Protestant pastor Samuel Bochart used natural knowledge to identify the animals mentioned in the Old Testament (Zur Shalev); and the polymath Athanasius Kircher took for granted that the Egyptian hieroglyphs he studied had much in common with the *prisca theologia* common to ancient Greeks and Jews (Daniel Stolzenberg). Scholarly methods made progress despite, or even because of, clear theological motives arising from Catholic or Protestant milieus.

The books under review deal with the most traditional material: the philological study of early Christianity and the text of the Bible, meaning interpreting ancient texts in historical rather than allegorical ways and accepting the possibility of textual error in the Bible. The recent turn to studying the interpenetration of theology and scholarship has marked these two books in different ways. The editors of *Scriptural Authority* propose a significant revision, arguing that in the earlier seventeenth century philology was in fact "subservient to systematic theology" (4), but eventually biblical criticism came into conflict with traditional beliefs and "claimed autonomy" (4–5). More sweeping is the approach of Nicholas Hardy, who sees the entire breadth of seventeenth-century philology from Joseph Scaliger to Richard Simon as indebted to theological and confessional concerns.

Clearly, two different definitions of Enlightenment are at work. In the case of *Scriptural Authority*, the endpoint is a philosophical movement that included antimonar-

chism, appeals for religious toleration, appeals to reason, and not very well concealed atheism. So this book contends, against the well-known works of Jonathan Israel, that humanist scholarship advanced and participated in the culture of its time and was not a legacy or relic that the Enlightenment had to overcome. On the other hand, the end of Hardy's story pinpoints a movement within humanistic scholarship involving systematic thought, a penchant for theory, a certain distrust of authority, and, again, a fondness for buzzwords such as "reason" and "critique." Here Hardy takes part in a current scholarly conversation about what separates the Renaissance from the Enlightenment in intellectual history. I would like to hear much more about both of these arguments.

A great many of the essays in *Scriptural Authority* contribute to the book's fundamental story of a philology advancing in sophistication and independence, although there is also a pleasing effect of center and periphery: as in real life, some scholars were keenly attentive to the leaders of their fields while others were conspicuously unaffiliated. What is more, as Dirk van Miert adds in his sensitive essay on Daniel Heinsius and Hugo Grotius, philology was not a mystical force that provoked the Enlightenment single-handed. In Erasmus's time, the wider theological and political world offered no "philosophical space" for subversive conclusions; and the social world might restrain the public expression of some, like Joseph Scaliger, but free others, like Benedict de Spinoza. So Van Miert suggests that only a philosopher, like Spinoza, could realize the potential that philology had created (106–7).

The most arresting case here of scholarship serving impassioned theological goals must be the New Testament manuscript tailor-made to disprove Erasmus's contention that there were no Greek witnesses for the famous trinitarian passage known as the *comma Johanneum*; Grantley McDonald presents a new identification for its English scribe. In the seventeenth century, Anthony Ossa-Richardson shows how André Rivet interpreted the Old Testament using the up-to-date method of imagining its Greek-speaking Jewish readers in New Testament times, but Rivet's aims remained remorselessly theological and sectarian.

On the front of intractable doubt, Benjamin Fisher explores Menasseh ben Israel's failed attempt to reconcile chronological discrepancies in the Old Testament, suggesting that Spinoza may have borrowed complaints about chronological contradictions from Menasseh's book while ridiculing Menasseh's solutions. Finally, on philology's escape from orthodoxy, Jetze Touber argues that Jonathan Israel's "Cartesian" theologians should instead be called "scripturarians": at first, they defended the integrity of the Bible against Spinoza with detailed and concrete arguments, yet that same appetite for historical study could also progress into a conviction that the biblical text was multiauthored and constructed over time.

The most hotly anticipated articles here are discussions of Spinoza by Anthony Grafton and Jonathan Israel, who in fact agree that Spinoza's heroic philosophy did not rest

on a career as a philologist. Grafton shows that in the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* Spinoza lifted from some biblical critics while overlooking the crucial findings of others, and he characterizes Spinoza's argumentative model as Aristotelian. Israel argues that Spinoza innovated relative to the earlier history of criticism by elucidating a distinction between what the author meant, *scopus*, and the real facts. But Spinoza's overriding point, surely, was to demote authorial intention from its place in traditional exegesis from Erasmus to Dannhauer—the Holy Spirit's meaning, which might contrast with the false literal meaning—to the subjective thoughts of a fallible human author.

For Nicholas Hardy, on the other hand, sacred philology never became autonomous during the seventeenth century. Even the celebrated Richard Simon innovated largely by responding to scholarly predecessors and nullifying their theological concerns. While in institutional terms Simon wrote within a history of Catholic discussion, he argued that his work was useful to the church and appealed for "an ever greater liberalization of Roman Catholic attitudes towards biblical criticism" (389). On the whole, Hardy's book shows scrupulously what is meant by saying for so many different scholars and projects that philology remained always within the sphere of theology throughout the century.

Hardy's most intensive arguments fall in the first third of the book, which explores Isaac Casaubon, John Selden, and Hugo Grotius as theological controversialists and scholars. The key terms here are "dogmatic" theology or "systematic" theology, meaning argument over a specific doctrine like the Eucharist. Above all, the 103-page chapter on Casaubon makes fundamental new contributions to our understanding of his career, and it is certainly the best account in print of what it is actually like to read his intricate *Exercitationes*.

What did change during the seventeenth century? Hardy's first answer is a refinement of method from an opportunistic, often conjectural style of criticism to a systematic and overarching approach to entire texts. At the same time, scholars began to confine theological controversy to arguments over the authority of the text rather than creating opportunities for doctrinal polemic at will. Hardy illustrates this in the central chapters through a series of attempts to edit the text of the Septuagint Greek translation of the Old Testament and assess its importance, by Jean Morin, Patrick Young, and James Ussher, along with the London Polyglot of Brian Walton. Incidentally, one of Hardy's many revisionary accounts of the Republic of Letters arises from Young's project, in which distrust, dissimulation, and a distinct lack of scholarly cooperation followed his repeated requests for readings from a Septuagint manuscript from Lucas Holstenius.

Hardy's polemic might have been moderated at some moments. No reader of Casaubon, Grotius, or Scaliger can miss their commitment to theological argument, and

the point has been regularly mentioned, including by Dirk van Miert on Grotius in *Scriptural Authority*. But Hardy's uncompromising and rigorous account will come as a salutary challenge to anyone who wants to discuss these subjects and as an enormous illumination to those who have not studied the primary material. His aim is precisely to plunge the reader into the disorienting morass of early modern erudition and to stress how different from us its inhabitants really were, even as their critical methods became more modern. To that extent, this book is the most forceful achievement so far of the new movement toward early modern scholarship and religion.

Kristine Haugen

Katharine P. Burnett, *Dimensions of Originality: Essays on Seventeenth-Century Chinese Art Theory and Criticism*. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 2013. Pp. 450. US$60 (cloth).

Few values have been more central in the Euro-American study of art history than originality. The celebratory cult of artistic genius that shaped the discipline through the 1970s was largely centered on uncovering first ("originary") works of formal or conceptual innovation ("originality"). However, non-Western art in general, and Chinese art more specifically, were assumed (if not asserted) to lack, or to be incapable of, concerns with originality. In particular, Chinese painting was often said to prize "orthodoxy," a value visually constructed through the copying of earlier masters.

Katharine P. Burnett's *Dimensions of Originality: Essays on Seventeenth-Century Chinese Art Theory and Criticism* sets this record straight. Divided into ten chapters, a preface, and an epilogue, the book traces the history of a single aesthetic concept—*qi* 奇, a slippery term that can be variously translated as "oddness" (as opposed to "evenness"), "strangeness," "marvelous difference," or, as Burnett argues, "(conceptual) originality." Developing the observations of earlier scholars including Wai-kam Ho and Judith Zeitlin, among others, Burnett shows that *qi* became the dominant aesthetic value in discourse on painting and calligraphy during China's "long seventeenth century" (ca. 1570–1720). Through its compilation and translation of a vast range of sources, the book makes a useful contribution to the field of Chinese art history; further, its treatment of the historiography of Chinese art history in chapters 1 and 2 will prove of interest to scholars in the broader field of art history and in the history of the humanities.